

**Assessment of Hadith Translations in Pursuit of  
Venuti's Domestication and Foreignization Strategies**

**Dr. Mohammad Sa'id Mitwally Al-Rahawan**

Dept. of Islamic Studies in English

Faculty of Languages and Translation, Al-Azhar University

**Abstract**

This paper provides an assessment of translation of Hadith discourse in light of Venuti's (1995) strategies of 'domestication' versus 'foreignization'. It aims at testing the applicability and adequacy of using such strategies by various translators of the six canonical books of hadith, based on the assumption that opting for either 'domestication' or 'foreignization' is left to the discretion of the translator according to specific factors such as the background of his readership, the goal of the target text and the message of the source text.

Keywords: Hadith – Translation –six canonical books– Venuti - foreignization –domestication.

**1. Introduction**

This paper provides an assessment of the translation of Hadith discourse in the light of Venuti's (1995) strategies of 'domestication' versus 'foreignization'. It aims at testing the applicability and adequacy of using such strategies by various translators of hadith, based on the assumption that opting for either 'domestication' or 'foreignization' is left to the discretion of the translator according to specific factors such as the background of his readership, the goal of the target text and the message of the source text.

**2. The Research Method**

In this assessment, I will use Venuti's strategies which primarily rely on his basic dichotomy between "foreignization" and "domestication". Venuti draws on Schleiermacher's notion on translation in the early 19th century when he proposes two alternative strategies for a translator: the translator can take the reader to the author, or bring the author to the reader (Venuti 2004:49). They refer to two techniques of translation later coined by Venuti; a translation, which 'domesticates' and a translation, which 'foreignizes' respectively.

According to Venuti, domestication refers to "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bring the author back home," while foreignization is "an ethnodeviant

pressure on those (cultural) values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad." (1995:20). On ethical grounds he elaborated in his *The Translator's Invisibility*, Venuti is against domestication, and for foreignization,

Venuti indicates that translation approaches "involve the basic tasks of choosing the foreign text to be translated and developing a method to translate it." (1998:240). By employing the concepts of domesticating and foreignizing, Venuti envisions a strategy for a translation; a method which tends to emphasize the significance of cultural variances in a source text. It comes through the following sub-norms:

1. A 'deliberate inclusion of foreignizing elements' (Munday 147). These 'norms' include linguistic elements that endorse foreignization in a TL. They adhere to the ST structure and syntax (e.g. the adjunct positions in the first sentence), as well as the calques and the archaic structure (Venuti 1998:16-17). All those elements were utilized by Venuti in his own translation of works by the nineteenth-century Italian Tarchetti. Venuti used both archaisms and colloquialisms in addition to British spelling to clash his reader with a 'heterogeneous discourse' (Venuti 1988:11), which are all of a crucial impact to make translation traces visible.
2. A translator's choice of a foreign text and the invention of translation discourses. A foreignizing translator can use "a discursive strategy that deviates from the prevailing hierarchy of dominant discourses (e.g. dense archaism), but also by choosing to translate a text that challenges the contemporary canon of foreign literature in the target language" (Venuti 1995:148,310). Venuti refers to Pound's (1954), departure from modern English to Anglo-Saxon text to imitate its "compound words, alliteration and accentual meter." (1995:34). He cites Pound, Newman and himself as examples of foreignizing translators. Archaism seems to be a major feature of this strategy. (1995:195).
3. Foreignization is further discerned, according to Venuti, by retention of the linguistic and cultural features of the source texts; what Jean-Jacques Lecercle calls 'remainder' (Venuti 1995:470-71). They include "regional or group dialects, jargons, clichés and slogans, stylistic innovations, archaisms, neologisms" (470-71). Xianbin

explains these markers further to include "technical terminologies ... and literary figures like metaphor." (2)<sup>1</sup>.

### 3. Domestication and Foreignization of Hadith discourse

#### 3.1. Syntactic Elements

Hadīth discourse has a unique syntactic structure which has an impact on meaning. According to Venuti, a translator is presumed to be "faithful to the foreign" text's syntactic structures by showing its foreign elements (1995:5). In a foreignizing translation, "the translator disrupts the linguistic and genre expectations of the target language in order to mark the otherness of the translated text". (Myskja 3). Domestication of syntactic structures may be discerned through 'rationalization'; a negative tendency coined by Berman referring to affecting syntactic structures of the original by "reordering its rambling sentences through punctuation and sentence order" (Berman 288). By reviewing various translations of Hadith anthologies, we could identify the following syntactic features, which are peculiar to Arabic.

##### 3.1.1. Verb-Subject-Object Sentence Order

In linguistic typology, Arabic is generally described as being VSO, with an alternative SVO order. Khan shows his adherence to Arabic syntactic structures by favoring the Arabic verb-subject-object. Throughout his translation of Bukhārī, he prefaces hadiths with the structure (V-S-O) as in the phrase, "Narrated Sa'īd b. Jubair: Ib 'Abbās in the explanation of the Statement of Allah (ﷻ) ...", which he rendered as a translation for the Arabic, "قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا سَعِيدُ بْنُ جُبَيْرٍ، عَنِ ابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ فِي قَوْلِهِ تَعَالَى: " (Bukhārī 1, 49). He consistently follows this reversed order of structure at the outset of each report. He deliberately includes this ungrammatical foreign syntactic elements in his translation. Poucke (2012:141) "measures" this level of translation as "strong foreignization". While Khān domesticates the text by following the V-S-O order, Abu Khaliyl, al-Khaṭṭāb and Ansari follow the regular English word order in their translations of Tirmidhi, Nasā'i and ibn Mājah.

##### 3.1.2. Non-Regular Use of Pronouns and Prepositions

It is a metalinguistic feature for Arabic verbs to assimilate various meanings in specific syntactic and stylistic cases; commonly known as '*taḍmīn*'. It is shown at the syntactic, stylistic and semantic

<sup>1</sup> He based himself on Venuti's email to a Chinese postgraduate student named Ma Jia (Eddie) on December 2, 2002. He referred to the url: <http://tscn.tongtu.net/>, as viewed on 2003-11-12 for a full text of the email but I could not find it.

levels. In syntax, Ibn Jinnī defines *taḍmīn* as a "verb implying the meaning of another verb, when each verb is connected to the regularly used preposition of the other" (ibn Jinnī 2:507). This is however an approximate coinage of the definition maintained by Arabic Language Assembly, Cairo (Yāsīn 17). An example of syntactic *taḍmīn* is the use of the pronoun 'man' (مَنْ) in the Prophet's saying:

"فَمَنْ وَفَى مِنْكُمْ فَأَجْرُهُ عَلَى اللَّهِ وَمَنْ أَصَابَ مِنْ ذَلِكَ شَيْئًا فَعُوقِبَ بِهِ، فَهُوَ كَفَّارَتُهُ، وَمَنْ أَصَابَ مِنْ ذَلِكَ شَيْئًا، فَسْتَرَهُ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ، إِنْ شَاءَ غَفَرَ لَهُ، وَإِنْ شَاءَ عَذَّبَهُ".

It is primarily classified as a relative pronoun but, by virtue of *taḍmīn*, it additionally functions as a conditional noun. This is the reason we had two various translations of the text: Khan renders it as solely implying the former meaning, "And whoever among you .... and whoever commits ....., and whoever commits...", while Belwey (Bukhārī H6402)<sup>2</sup> renders it as a conditional noun, "If any of you". In this hadith, I believe that Belwey's translation reveals peculiar syntactic features of the source text. Throughout Bukhārī 'man' grammatically functions as a relative pronoun and a conditional noun simultaneously. In most cases Khan and Belwey favor rendering it as a relative pronoun such as in (Khan 1, 105; Belwey H103), (Khan 1, 110; Belwey H110). We can safely say that the majority of their renderings of 'man' do not reflect the salient feature of the source text's peculiar structure. Such is the case of Khattāt (5, 141) and Khaliyl (3, 225).

Furthermore, *taḍmīn* is extended to include a non-regular use of prepositions, such as ibn Mas'ūd's saying, (كَانَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) (يَتَخَوَّلُنَا بِالْمَوْعِظَةِ فِي الْأَيَّامِ، كَرَاهَةَ السَّامَةِ عَلَيْنَا). The noun 'السامة' is regularly connected with the preposition 'من', not 'على'. When the regular preposition is substituted, it implies boredom and stressful difficulty. Khān does not draw a reader's attention to this implication in his translation. He renders it as "The Prophet (ﷺ) used to take care of us in preaching by selecting a suitable time, so that we might not get bored". (Bukhārī, 1, 97). Other translators of Bukhārī could not render *taḍmīn* implied by this word. Belwey renders it as 'not wanting it to become boring for us'. Such is the case of Khaliyl (Tirmidhi 5, 197). I presume a foreginizing translator may reflect the meaning of boredom and stress by rendering it as, "lest it should lay aggravating boredom on us".

<sup>2</sup> Belwey's translation is only available online: <http://bewley.virtualave.net/>. Web. 25 April 2015. Since it has not been published in print, I use hadith numbers in my quotations.

In Bukhārī (1, 53), Heraclius is reported as saying, "وَلَوْ كُنْتُ عِنْدَهُ" *وَلَوْ كُنْتُ عِنْدَهُ*. The verb '*ghasala*' is transitive which requires a direct object. It is not used with a preposition. A non-regular use of the verb with a preposition adds a connotation. Instead of rendering it 'I would certainly wash his feet' as Khan does, it means 'wash off his feet in reverence' (Ibn Hajar 2,16). Similarly, the verb 'يعود' is used with the preposition 'إلى'. When it is used with 'في' in the Prophet's saying, "وَأَنْ يَكْرَهُ أَنْ يَعُودَ فِي الْكُفْرِ" the meaning changes. Khan renders it as 'to revert to disbelief' though it is supposed to mean 'to revert and stabilize in disbelief' (Ibn Hajar 1, 62). Neither Khaliyl (Tirmidhi 5, 32) nor Khattāb (Nasā'ī, 6, 17) could reveal the intrinsic meaning of the structure.

Overlooking *taḍmīn* in some cases led to fatal mistranslations of texts such as Khan's rendering of the Prophet's saying, "قوموا فأصل" *قوموا فأصل* to mean "Get up. I shall lead you in the prayer" though the non-regular use of the preposition 'ل' changed the meaning to be 'Get up to invoke Allah for you' (Ibn Hajar 1, 489). Similarly, the use of 'إلى' in the context of the statement, "فَأَبَّا نَرَى وَجْهَهُ وَنَصِيحَتَهُ إِلَى الْمُنَافِقِينَ" makes the translation of Khan "but we have always seen him mixing with hypocrites" seem different from ibn Hajar's explanation of the verb to be "we see his favoritism and his loyalty to the hypocrites". (Ibn Hajar 1, 522).

In conclusion, Khan, Khattāb, Ansari or Khalily could not reflect *taḍmīn* in their translations of Bukhārī, Nasā'ī, Trimidhī and ibn Mājah either due to the difficulty of introducing readable English equivalent that makes their style fluent or due to rendering a literal translation of the Arabic text.

### 3. 2. Lexical Elements

#### 3.2.1. Lexical Archaism

Venuti regards a dense use of archaic lexical items as part of 'a discursive strategy' to evade prevalence of a domestic discourse (1995:148). Khān sticks to a dense use of archaic words in his translation. Sometimes his recourse to archaism does not maintain an adequate choice for foreignization. It sometimes cause inconsistency or a mistranslation. For instance, he dominantly uses the word 'apostle' in reference to Prophet Muhammad, in almost 6408 occurrences. Though he is much allergic to all biblical terms of loaded cultural variations, Khān uses the word in its inappropriate meaning. In the Bible, an '*apostle*' refers to one of the twelve disciples chosen by Christ to preach his gospel (Elwell 'Apostle'). Most other translators of Ḥadith refer to '*rasūl*' as Messenger and to '*nabiyy*' as a

'Prophet'. Capitalization may refer to an underlying foreignization of the text without recourse to the biblical term.

Furthermore, an extravagant use of exotic terms may show the text as a mystery, especially when Khan uses transliteration for words which have English equivalent without being of cultural significance, but to obscure the meaning, such as his rendering of the phrase,

"يَمْرُقُونَ مِنَ الدِّينِ مُرُوقَ السَّهْمِ مِنَ الرَّمِيَّةِ، فَيَنْظُرُ الرَّامِي إِلَى سَهْمِهِ إِلَى نَصْلِهِ إِلَى رِصَافِهِ، فَيَتَمَارَى فِي الْفُوقَةِ، هَلْ عَلِقَ بِهَا مِنَ الدَّمِ شَيْءٌ"

as "they will go out of their religion as an arrow darts through the game, whereupon the archer may look at his arrow, its Nasl at its Risaf and its Fuqa to see whether it is blood-stained or not". Words like '*naşl*', '*rişāf*' and '*fūq*' are not of a cultural significance of the text so that he put them in orthographic forms. The cultural variation lies in the simile used in the text, not in the lexical items. Therefore, it is more adequate to present those terms in their English equivalents, "the archer looks at his arrow, arrowhead and its fastening and is unsure about its notch". Yasir Qadhi renders a more smooth translation which could clear the fog, "they will pass out of the religion like an arrow passing through the target, and they will not return until the arrow returns to its nock." (Sunan Abi Dāwūd, 5, 249). Such is the case of Khaliyl and Khaṭṭāb. The former renders it as, "they will passes through Islam as an arrow passes through the body of the target," (Nasā'ī, 3, 390) while the latter translates it as, "going through the religion as an arrow goes through the target." (Trimidhī, 4, 246).

### 3.2.2. 'Conventional' and 'Loaded' Proper Nouns

According to Hermens, proper nouns are categorized into conventional and 'Loaded names' (Hermans 12). The former seem 'unmotivated', while the latter 'motivate' for translation and range from faintly 'suggestive' to overtly 'expressive' names and nicknames (Hermans 12). Some historical names like prophets, saints and kings mentioned in the bible are examples of 'loaded' proper nouns. A translator of hadith has two opposing strategies of rendering them to English readers: either to present them in their biblical forms or to adapt a pre-established translation norm such as orthographic adaptation. For example, a Muslim translator of Hadith looks at David as a biblical historical figure with its Judaic associations including biblical passages as (2 Sam. 11:2-27) which conflict with Muslim perspective of Prophets' infallibility. A translator usually resorts to

transcription or transliteration to introduce Islamic ideological perspective associated with Dāwūd; the infallible Prophet. Khan opts for the latter to emphasize Muslim ethnocentric attitude. Moreover, the name 'Eve' is loaded with religious associations such as the Judo-Christian concept of original sin while Ḥawwā' is an Islamic form associated with the Quranic verse; "no bearer of burdens will bear the burden of another" (Quran 6:164)<sup>3</sup>. Such is the case of Jesus who is depicted as 'son of God' versus 'Isā who is rendered as 'God's slave and servant' (Quran 19:30).

The problem of rendering historical names is a reiteration of the heated argument raised on how 'English Christian names should be translated' (Aixelá 59) into Spanish; an argument which lasted for fifty years and found its ramifications in translations of Shakespearean's names (59). In Hadith discourse rendering those names in their biblical forms does not necessarily require a tacit approval of all ideological bearings of the name, but they still pose an anticipated dominance of the target text's culture. Foreignizing those names by the adoption of orthographic forms proves fidelity to the translated text.

### 3.2.3. Technical Terms

In his translation of Bukhārī, Khan is very conservative in presenting Islamic technical terms in orthographic forms. He does not adopt English coinages or spelling forms in modern English dictionaries. Terms like *salah*, *hajj*, which became parts of contemporary English dictionaries are rendered by Khan as *ṣalāh* and *ḥajj*. He still uses them as foreign elements inserted at the text. It stems from his conviction that Muslim *ṣalāh* is different from Christian prayers. Foreignization by the adoption of transliteration becomes inevitable when it relates to terms like *jihād*, which has cultural associations.

Khan further resorts to 'clarification' in translating the Arabic word '*an-Nāmūs*' in the report, "هَذَا النَّامُوسُ الَّذِي نَزَّلَ اللَّهُ عَلَىٰ مُوسَىٰ". Khān domesticates it by rendering it in an explanatory translation, "This is the same one who keeps the secrets (angel Gabriel)". Belew refers to orthographic adaptation by rendering it as "Namus" and then designating it as Gabriel (H3). The reason Khan refers to 'clarification' is the absence of an English equivalent of the word. The only

<sup>3</sup> In quoting English translation of the Quran, I used Umm Muhammad, Aminah Assami (2005) *Sahih International Quran Translation*. Saudi Arabia: Dar Abdulqasim

available equivalent for this word is '*nomos*,' which refers in Greek mythology to "the daemon of laws and ordinance" (Collins "*nomos*"), but it may be branded as a 'qualitative impoverishment' (Hermens 150). However, the word is only reported by Bukhārī and Muslim. Siddiqui (Sahih Muslim, 1, 138) imitates Khan in rendering it in a transliterated form and, thus domesticated it.

The problem of translating technical terms of Bukhārī arises when Khan attempts to domesticate the text to seem logical and fluent for English readers. The reason is that most of Khan's clarifications are based on his own interpretation of the text or on commentaries of earlier exegetes. For example, 'a pledge of allegiance to this Prophet' is further defined as '(i.e. embrace Islam).' (Bukhārī 1, 55). Some of Khan's clarifications are redundant and ascertain that one reads a commentary domesticated to be instructive and informative. Berman calls this an 'empty' expansion, which "adds nothing, that it augments only the gross mass of the text" (Berman 290). An example is Khan's explication of the essential pillars of Islam in brackets as, "To testify that there is no deity (owing the right to be worshipped) but Allah and that Muhammad is Allah's Messenger, to offer the (compulsory congregational) prayers dutifully and perfectly, to pay Zakat (i.e. obligatory charity), to perform Hajj. (i.e. Pilgrimage to Mecca)" (Bukhārī 1, 58).

Khan's intensive clarifications of technical terms led to an overall 'expansion' i.e. "translation tends to be longer than the original" (Berman 290). Khan provides elaborate explanations of most transliterated terms he introduces. For example, the word '*mabrūr*' is explained to be "(i.e. accepted by Allah, performed with the intention of seeking Allah's pleasure only and not to show off, without committing a sin and in accordance with the traditions of the Prophet)." (Bukhārī 1, 67). Extensive elaborations of Khan's translation exist in almost all of his translation and pose one of the critical points for his work. For example in the first volume, Khan provides more than 30 clarifications, most of which are redundant: (Bukhārī 1, 63, 67, 72, 73, 74, 109).

I believe an adequate strategy for translating Islamic technical terms of Hadith consists in domesticating those terms by the adoption of transliteration. A glossary of technical terms has to be supplemented at the end of a translated work.

### 3.2.4. Honorific Words

A translator may express a high degree of conservatism to the source text by rendering it in exotic form by either introducing it in its original script or by making 'orthographic adaptation,' 'where the original is expressed in different alphabet' (Aixelá 61) by transcription or transliteration. Khan prefers the use of Arabic honorific symbols following certain names in the body of his English text as an imitation of the Arabic source. For example, He suffixes certain names with honorific phrases expressed in Arabic script such as (ﷲ) 'Lord of majesty and Bounty', (ﷲ) 'the Mighty and Sublime' or (ﷲ) 'Glorified be He'. He further adds (ﷺ) 'blessings and peace be upon him', (ﷺ) 'may Allah be pleased with him', (ﷺ) 'May Allah be pleased with her' following names of Prophet Muhammad, a member of his male or female companions respectively. Honorific symbols pose a challenge for fluency especially for non-Arab readers or those unfamiliar with Arabic scripts. Khan does not render meanings of those symbols at the glossary of technical terms though he dominantly used them at his work. By using those honorific expressions, Khan affirms that they are of the type of invocations that have to be recited in Arabic sounds as they have originally been intended to be though a reader does not know how to articulate these phrases. Khan opts for a strategy, which follows Venut's emphasis on endorsing discursive foreign elements of the source text, though it is not pragmatic in the translation of Hadith.

### 3.2.5. Toponyms

Toponyms refer to various place names, proper names of the location, region or part of the Earth's surface with its natural and artificial features, e.g., City of God, Bara, Rio (Espindola 49-50). Bukhārī includes numerous place names, which Khan renders in various strategies. First, he introduces toponyms in their Arabic transliterated forms adding notes to demarcate their recent political borders such as '*ash-Shām*,' which is rendered by Khan as 'Sham (Syria, Palestine, Lebanon and Jordan)' (Bukhārī 1, 50, 142). Aixelá terms this 'extratextual gloss,' where an additional explanation is offered in the target text to clarify the meaning for the reader. Such explanations usually appear as footnotes, glossary items or detailed explanations in brackets (67). Second, Khan provides toponyms in orthographic forms without reference to their limits such as in (Bukhārī 1, 55; 2, 350; 2, 169). He further renders '*ash-Shām*' in (Bukhārī 1, 265) as referring to 'Jerusalem' while in (Bukhārī 5:455) as 'Syria'.

Third, Khan foreignizes a toponym by giving its English equivalent though it entails a cultural dominance of the target text. For

example, Khan uses 'Mecca' and 'Medina' for names of the two holy cities though they have been objected by some Muslims to be misnomers of the proper Makkah and Madinah (Gibb 1). Inconsistent renderings of toponyms makes it difficult to determine Khan's strategy of translating them. Khaliyl consistently domesticates topynyms without clarifying their original places or demarcations (Tirmidhi 1, 42). Such is the case of Khattāb (Nasā'i 3, 433)

### 3.2.6. Anthroponyms

Anthroponyms include people's names and nicknames as well encompassing names that refer to regional background (Espindola 49-50). Like his translation of toponyms, Khan is inconsistent in adopting a definite strategy in translating anthroponyms. For example, he translates '*ar-Rūm*' as 'Romans' in (6, 250; 6, 299; 6, 303), while he uses 'Byzantines' in (Bukhārī 4, 112, 119, 121, 124, 188). A historical investigation may reveal anachronism. The problem lies in his references to peoples who still exist today. Though he manages to foreignize Yemenites (Bukhārī 4, 211) he fails to adopt the same strategy for 'Syrians' (Bukhārī 1, 245) and 'Ethiopians' (Bukhārī 1, 288). The latter can be easily foreignized by as 'Abyssinians'.

In conclusion, toponyms and anthroponyms may have English equivalents with a historical bearing. The most adequate strategy is to present them in their English equivalents. Transliteration is the option for rendering toponyms and anthroponyms with no English equivalents or those whose English equivalents are of sensitive cultural problems.

### 3.4. Cultural Markers

Culture makers are signs of identity of a particular culture. They include as, Xianbin (2) quotes Venuti, "technical terminologies ... and literary figures like metaphor.". They include 'reminders', a term Venuti borrowed from Lecercle to refer to elements that constitute a foreign element within the target cultures which can be used to mark the foreignness of a translated text (Venuti 1998,11). A good translator, according to Venuti can "release the remainder by cultivating a heterogeneous discourse, opening up the standard dialect and literary canons to what is foreign to themselves, to the substandard and marginal" (1998, 11).

#### 3.4.1. Figures of speech

The Collins English Dictionary defines figure of speech as "an expression such as a simile, in which words do not have their literal meaning, but are categorized as multi-word expressions that act in the

text as units" ("figure"). Arabic is a figurative language because it uses figures of speech. Since Arabic figures of speech primarily rely on the process of migration from a primary meaning to a figurative connotation, it entails ambiguity, which undermines the clarity of a source text.

### 3.4.1.1. Euphemism

Euphemism, as Leech (147) defines, is "the practice of referring to something offensive or delicate in terms that make it sound more pleasant or becoming than it really is." For the Prophet's saying, "إن من شر الناس عند الله منزلة يوم القيامة الرجل يفضي إلى المرأة وتقضي إليه ثم ينشر سرها" (Bukhārī 2:399). The word 'يفضي' is a euphemism for 'having sexual intercourse'. Khan translates it as, "escorts with his wife". There are, however, three strategies for rendering this euphemism:

- To translate it literally by reference to the lexical meaning of '*afḍa*' i.e. to occupy the *fadā'* (place or space) of someone (Lane 2414). By following this technique, Siddiqi has deleted euphemism in his translation, "the man who goes to his wife and she goes to him" (Muslim 838).
- To provide a literal translation of euphemism by including a non-euphemistic addition to the text like rendering the phrase as, 'to go to his wife [for carnal intercourse]'.
- To disregard euphemism by providing the intended meaning as the translator of abū Dāwūd's *sunan* does, "a man who has intercourse with his wife" (abū Dāwūd 5, 298).

Khan's translation adopted foreignization by conveying the meaning in obscure terms without being literal. Khan applies different strategies in translating euphemism in Bukhārī.

Bukhārī relates the story of three men who took shelter in a cave where the rock blocked it and each one started to reiterate a sincere act that he offered for God. The second one reiterated his story with his cousin whom he seduced. When she agreed he was between her legs, she said, (اتَّقِ اللَّهَ وَلَا تُفْضِ الْخَاتَمَ إِلَّا بِحَقِّهِ). I will compare five translations of this euphemism. Khan provides two translations; where he, at the first (Bukhārī 3, 232) translates it as "she asked me not to deflower her except rightfully (by marriage)". He provides an English euphemistic word with an equivalent meaning, but without providing a deep sense of obscurity as it appears in the original text. Aishah Belewiy imitates Khan to some extent, "Fear Allah and do not deflower without right" (Bukhārī H3278). It is a form of domestication. Khan provides another translation for the phrase, "It is illegal for you to outrage my chastity except by legitimate marriage." He creates a euphemistic expression not familiar in English by

rendering the word '*khatam*' as chastity. It does seem to equate with the Arabic elegant expression. Siddqui could grasp that elegance by his, "fear Allah and do not break the seal (of chastity) but by lawful means" (Muslim 1672). He provides a noun-euphemistic clarification, where he draws the text closer to the English reader to clarify the significance of the phrase. In his translation of *Riyaḍ aṣ-Ṣāliḥīn*, Yusuf renders another variant of Bukhārī translation where he presented it as, "Fear Allah and do not break the seal unlawfully" (Nawawī 5). I presume this is a pure foreignization of the text.

Euphemism is used in hadith discourse for depicting male-female intimate relation. The following report has two examples of this type of euphemism. The Arabic text reads as follows:

جَاءَتْ امْرَأَةً رِفَاعَةَ الْقُرْظِيِّ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ، فَقَالَتْ: كُنْتُ عِنْدَ رِفَاعَةَ، فَطَلَّقْتِي، فَأَبَتْ طَلَّاقِي، فَتَزَوَّجْتُ عَبْدَ الرَّحْمَنِ بْنَ الزَّبِيرِ إِنَّمَا مَعَهُ مِثْلُ هُدْبَةِ الثَّوْبِ، فَقَالَ: «أَتُرِيدِينَ أَنْ تَرْجِعِي إِلَى رِفَاعَةَ؟ لَا، حَتَّى تَدُوقِي عُسَيْلَتَهُ وَيَدُوقَ عُسَيْلَتَكَ»

The first euphemism lies in the phrase '*hudbatu thawb*' which is translated according to different strategies as follows:

- Khan: "he is impotent" (Bukhārī 3, 489).
- Khaṭṭāb: 'what he has is like the fringe of a garment' (Nasāī 4, 131)
- Siddique: 'what he possess is like the fringe of a garment (i.e. he is sexually weak)' (Muslim 834)
- Belew: " the frayed end of cloth [i.e. impotent]" (Bukhārī H2496)

Khan domesticates the text by giving the intended meaning, while others provide varying degrees of foreignization except Siddique and Belew who provide clarifying notes. However, we can hardly find an English equivalent for this euphemistic expression but Khaṭṭāb's translation foreignizes it.

The other euphemism used in this context is the sentence, ' حَتَّى تَدُوقِي عُسَيْلَتَهُ وَيَدُوقَ عُسَيْلَتَكَ'. Khan completely avoids literal translation. He renders it as "until the second husband consummates his marriage with her" (Bukhārī 7, 136). Belew put it as "until you have enjoyed his sweetness and he has enjoyed your sweetness". She imitates the source text, which introduces a foreign expression to the target text. But is there a reason for Khan's abandonment of a literal translation of this euphemistic expression? I presume he regards the expression as dysphemistic, which contrasts neutral euphemism. Therefore, he attempts to alleviate the tone of a receptor's reaction to the text. However, the Prophet's use of this expression is intended for a legal reason. When a woman is irrevocably divorced for three times, she is not supposed to remarry her ex-husband except upon marrying

another without a mutual consent. She has, then, to consummate this marriage. Tumaymah b. Wahb; the woman who encountered with the prophet in a dialogue liked to get back to Rifā'ah without a consummation of the second marriage so that she accused her husband of impotence. This is the reason the Prophet uses dysphemism reprimand both her and her ex-husband. Khan, however, domesticates both expressions to make his translation rational and intelligible for his target audience.

### 3.4.1.2. Metonymy

According to Merriam-Webster, this is "a figure of speech in which a thing or concept is called not by its own name, but rather by the name of something associated in meaning with that thing or concept" ("metonymy"). The Arabic approximate equivalent for metonymy is *kināyah*, where the name of an item is moved to fill in something else with which it is linked (Ḥanbakah 2, 127). Abdul-Raof distinguishes between Arabic *kināyah* and the English metonymy by affirming that "Metonymy in classical Arabic signifies the intrinsic signification of the lexical item employed by the communicator" (233). A translator is presumed to recognize a metonymy, identifies its culture reference and renders it to an English reader by maintaining a level of elegance and its cultural variation.

In Bukhari, the well-known *ḥadīth* of Umm Zar' is a masterpiece of artistic and literary language in which 'Aishah; the Prophet's wife relates to the Prophet anecdotes of eleven women depicting their spouses' affairs with them. The report includes numerous metonyms. Khan is not consistent in either foreignizing or domesticating the text. For example, Khan translates, "عظيم الرماد" as "His ashes are abundant" (Bukhārī 7, 82) by leaving a target audience in abyss of guessing the meaning. Though he provides clarifying notes (i.e. generous to his guests), a reader cannot comprehend the cultural reference or relation between ashes and guests. Khan's clarification classified his rendering to be completely domesticating. He further domesticates 'رفيع العماد' which literally means 'one who has a raised ceiling' as 'tall generous man' but he foreignizes 'طويل النجاد' by rendering it as 'wearing a long strap for carrying his sword'. The fifth woman describes her husband as 'إِنْ دَخَلَ فَهَدَى، وَإِنْ خَرَجَ أَسَدًا'. Khan reveals the secret of why he is leopard at home while he turns a lion outside by domesticating the meaning through explanatory notes to show that he 'sleeps a lot' at home and 'boasts a lot' in front of men. The sixth woman defames her husband's image by enlisting his bad qualities through five euphemistic expressions as follows, 'إِنْ أَكَلَ لَفًا، وَإِنْ شَرِبَ اشْتَفَى، وَإِنْ اضْطَجَعَ اتَّفَى، وَلَا يُوَلِّجُ الْكَفَّ؛ لِيَعْلَمَ الْبَيْتُ

domesticates the text by providing the intended meaning of those expressions, "The sixth one said, "If my husband eats, he eats too much (leaving the dishes empty), and if he drinks he leaves nothing; if he sleeps he rolls himself (alone in our blankets); and he does not insert his palm to inquire about my feelings." (Bukhārī 7, 82). Khan reveals what is supposed to be concealed. Other translators of Bukhari do not transfer euphemism in their English translations. Belwey, for example, imitates Khan with slight lexical and stylistic variations (Bukhārī H4893). I propose those expressions may be foreignized as follows, "If my husband eats, he cleans up. If he drinks, he gets all sups. If he sleeps, he wraps himself up, stretching no hands to show I am up".

The seventh woman expressed her husband's impotence in euphemistic expression, which is interpreted differently by commentators of Hadith,

"زَوْجِي غَيَايَاءُ أَوْ عَيَايَاءُ طَبَاقَاءُ كُلُّ دَاءٍ لَهُ دَاءٌ شَجَّكَ أَوْ فَلَّكَ أَوْ جَمَعَ كَلًّا لَكَ"

The original text is dot-distorted. The word 'غياياء' has been exchanged with 'عييياء' in a stage of transmission due to a misreading of a written version of the report. Khan does not convey technical mechanism to his readers. He translated the two variants as probably intended in the original text. Furthermore, he translates the word nude of its euphemistic ornament. Belwey utterly expressed the intended meaning by rendering it as, "heavy in spirit or impotent". The word 'طبقاء' is literally derived from the verb '*ṭabaqa*' (to cover). A camel is '*ṭabāqā*', when it lacks strength or ability to cover distances. A man is '*ṭabāqā*' because he is impeded in his speech (Lane 1827). Khan domesticates it as 'foolish'. I suggest it be rendered as 'tongue tied' to show fidelity to the 'letter' and to show the aesthetic traces of the ST euphemism.

The eighth woman shows her husband in an elegant style by describing his touches and smells as, 'الْمَسُّ مَسُّ أَرْنَبٍ، وَالرَّيْحُ رَيْحُ زَرْنَبٍ'. Khan domesticates the text by clarifying the reason of making a similarity between her husband and a rabbit, "My husband is soft to touch like a rabbit." The tenth woman refers to her man's generosity by describing his camels as follows:

"زَوْجِي مَالِكٌ وَمَا مَالِكٌ، مَالِكٌ حَيْرٌ مِنْ ذَلِكَ، لَهُ إِبِلٌ كَثِيرَاتُ الْمَبَارِكِ قَلِيلَاتُ الْمَسَارِحِ، وَإِذَا سَمِعْنَ صَوْتَ الْمَرْهَرِ أَيَقَنَّ أَنَّهُنَّ هُوَ الْكُ"

Khan fully domesticates the text by clarifying its meaning, "Most of his camels are kept at home (ready to be slaughtered for the guests) and only a few are taken to the pastures. When the camels hear the

sound of the lute (or the tambourine) they realize that they are going to be slaughtered for the guests". We can smell that elegant fragrance of the desert in Belew's rendering, "He has camels, most of which are kept in pens while only a few are sent to graze. When they hear the sound of the lute, they are certain that they will be slaughtered." (Bukhārī H4893) It gives a room for the reader's imagination to contemplate both letter and intent of the text. The only problem of Belew's translation is that she abused the rhyme, which is intended in this narrative. The eleventh woman, the report is known for her name, is umm Zar', gave a positive and faithful description of her spouses' good days with her, though, he at the end divorced her and got married to another woman. She described everything surrounding her husband starting with him,

"أَنَاسَ مِنْ حُلِيِّ أَدْنَى، وَمَلَأَ مِنْ شَحْمِ عَضُدَيَّ، وَبَجَّحَنِي فَبَجَحْتَ إِلَيَّ نَفْسِي، وَجَدَنِي فِي أَهْلِ  
عُنَيْمَةِ بِشِقِّي، فَجَعَلَنِي فِي أَهْلِ صَهِيلٍ وَأَطِيطٍ وَدَائِسٍ وَمُنَقِّ، فَعِنْدَهُ أَقُولُ فَلَا أَقْبَحُ وَأَرْقُدُ  
فَأَتَصَبَّحُ."

Khan renders it as, "He has given me many ornaments and my ears are heavily loaded with them and my arms have become fat (i.e., I have become fat). And he has pleased me, and I have become so happy that I feel proud of myself. He found me with my family who were mere owners of sheep and living in poverty, and brought me to a respected family having horses and camels and threshing and purifying grain. Whatever I say, he does not rebuke or insult me. When I sleep, I sleep till late in the morning, and when I drink water (or milk), I drink my fill." I however, propose to foreignize the text as follows, "Of gold he made my ears dressy, filled out the flesh so it is heavy, delighted me and made me happy. He found me in people of sheep to grow displacing me to people of horses and camels, oxen and crops to plow. No rebuke when I speak nor awake when I sleep."

To conclude, I prefer presenting Arabic euphemisms and metonymys of Hadith through a foreignizing strategy for the following reasons: First, there is a definite relation between the literal and intended meanings of euphemism. This relation is known by the original text. Second, euphemism "is purposefully employed to keep a reader from a reality or an emotion that could prove to be embarrassing or hurtful" (Abddalh 76). It becomes marginalized when the meaning of euphemism is transferred prone of any aesthetic ornament. Third, euphemism primarily relies on "domestic values, social recreations and ideological forces (Munday 145) which are hardly identified in parallel equivalents in target language.

### 3.4.1.3. Metaphor

This refers to a figure of speech in which a word or a phrase is applied to an object or action that it does not literally denote in order to imply a resemblance (Collins "metaphor"). Soskice (1) affirms the dependence of religious language in almost all traditions upon metaphorical speech. In Hadith discourse, a word may be used to indicate a literal, a juristic or a customary meaning. In the latter two cases a word departs from the literal to the metaphorical. For instance, the Arabic word '*riba*' may be used in its literal sense to mean 'increase' or in its juristic meaning to mean 'usury'. In some cases, distinction between literal and metaphorical usages of a locution is plain but in other cases it is not. I will give examples of metaphors of this type. How Khan responds to phrases not determined to be used in literal or metaphorical senses and which strategy seems adequate in translating those metaphors?

To give an example, the Prophet is reported as saying, "الْمُتَبَايَعَانِ" "كُلُّ وَاحِدٍ مِنْهُمَا بِالْخِيَارِ عَلَى صَاحِبِهِ مَا لَمْ يَنْفَرَقَا، إِلَّا بَيْعُ الْخِيَارِ". The word '*al-mutabāyi'ān*' may linguistically refer to the 'two purchasing parties' and metaphorically to the 'two negotiating parties'. Moreover, the word '*yatfarraqa*' may be literally translated as 'physically depart' or 'end negotiation'. This is the reason Ḥanfī and Mālikī jurists upheld that as long as negotiations are going on, the option of cancellation is still effective. Shāfi'ī jurists maintain that the right of cancellation terminates by physical departure of the session. Proponents of the first view based their argument on similar phrases of traditions such as the word '*yabi*' in the Prophet's saying, "لا يبيع أحدكم على بيع أخيه" is used to mean 'bargain'. Khan opts for a literal translation of the phrase, "Both the buyer and the seller have the option of canceling" (Bukhārī 3, 183). By translating the phrase to be of one definite meaning, Khan domesticates the text to a Shāfi'ī interpretation. He gives clarification of the text by introducing the 'indefinite' in the form of a 'definite'. Khaṭṭāb foreignizes the phrase as 'the two parties to a transaction.' (Nasā'ī 5, 261).

Though Khan attempts to be literal in translating metaphors, excessive clarifications draws his renderings towards domestication. This is evident in a number of instances such as his translation of the Prophet's saying,

"فَزْنَا الْعَيْنَ النَّظْرَ، وَزْنَا اللِّسَانَ الْمَنْطِقَ، وَالنَّفْسَ تَمَنَّى وَتَشْتَهِي، وَالْفَرْجَ يُصَدِّقُ ذَلِكَ، وَيُكَذِّبُهُ"

"The adultery of the eye is the looking (at something which is sinful to look at), and the adultery of the tongue is to utter (what it is unlawful to utter)" (Bukhārī 8, 398). Qadhi foreignizes the text as follows, "The fornication of the eyes is the see and the fornication of the tongue is to talk." (abū Dāwūd 2, 554).

Furthermore, Khan domesticates the phrase 'النذير العريا' in the Prophet's saying,

"مَثَلِي وَمَثَلُ مَا بَعَثَنِي اللَّهُ كَمَثَلِ رَجُلٍ أَتَى قَوْمًا فَقَالَ: رَأَيْتُمُ الْجَيْشَ بِعَيْنَيَّ، وَإِنِّي أَنَا النَّذِيرُ  
الْغُرَيَانِ"

"My example and the example of the message with which Allah has sent me is like that of a man who came to some people and said, "I have seen with my own eyes the enemy forces, and I am a naked warner (to you) so save yourself. (Bukhārī 8, 325). Belewly could foreignize it as follows: " My example and that of the what Allah sent me with is like a man who comes to some people and says, 'I have seen the army with my own eyes. I am naked warner. Save yourselves! Save yourselves!'" (Bukhārī H6117).

In some cases Khan opts for translating the intended meaning of a metaphor by deleting the metaphoric imagery. Sedighi explains it as, "converting the metaphorical expression into sense" (Sedighi 209). Khan renders the phrase, 'زهرة الدنيا', as 'the splendor and luxury of the worldly life' (Bukhārī 4, 142), though it may be retained as 'blossom of this life'. Similarly, he translates the phrase, 'يمرقون من الدين كما يمرق' as, "who will go out of (renounce) the religion (Islam) as an arrow passes through the game," (Bukhārī 9, 489), where he keeps the metaphor but domesticates the text through clarifying notes.

Khan does not opt for domestication in all his renderings of metaphors. Sometimes he refers to foreignization to make a metaphor obscure as in the Prophet's words, "وَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّ الْجَنَّةَ تَحْتَ ظِلَالِ السُّيُوفِ", which is rendered by Khān as "Know that Paradise is under the shades of swords".

In conclusion, Khan attempts to retain metaphors in his translation, but his excessive use of explicatory notes and rationalization draw his texts home. I believe the context of traditions can efficiently clarify the message without recourse to rationalize or clarification.

### 3.4.2. Ideological and Ethical Constraints

Religious texts, as Hatim (35) concludes, are "carriers of ideological meaning and vulnerable to changing socio-cultural norms". Translation of religious texts may be influenced by the target leadership in this case, "religious and ethical norms can hinder or at

least impede the use of both foreignization and domestication in translation, especially if the target readership has a conservative religious nature" (Mansour 4).

In Hadith discourse, a translation problem is a subsequent of syntactic ambiguity when a text harbors two linguistically acceptable interpretations, but a translator's choice is primarily determined by his ideological tendency. It may further arise when a text is apt to encompass a number of indefinite variables but a translator restricts it to one definite meaning in order to substantiate a certain approach. If a translator moves towards his readers by adopting a unilateral attitude by disregarding others, it is a domestication tailored to serve ideological leanings.

In Bukhārī, we encounter a series of structures that feature grammatical ambiguity because of pronominal reference. For instance the structure (خَلَقَ اللَّهُ آدَمَ عَلَى صُورَتِهِ) has a pronominal affix (هـ) cliticized to the proper noun (الله), resulting in syntactic ambiguity, which has also led to different interpretations and translations. This pronominal object affix can either refer to (God) which leads to the meaning that Adam has a form as Allah has a form (both are not identical or similar) or refer to (Adam) thus leading to the meaning that Adam has been created in the form Allah has chosen for him. Khan chooses the second meaning by assuming that the antecedent of the pronoun is Adam, thus meaning that Allah created Adam in his (meaning Adam's) complete form (Bukhārī 8, 246). This, however, conflicts with the other variant version related by Ibn Abī 'Aṣim (1, 228) in which the Prophet said, (فَإِنَّ ابْنَ آدَمَ خُلِقَ عَلَى صُورَةِ الرَّحْمَنِ). In comparing the two narrations, it is evident that the most appropriate translation would be "Allah created Adam in His form", but due to ideological constraints, Khan had to opt for a safe interpretation lest his translation should be classified as of Ash'arī<sup>4</sup> leanings. Khan's ideological contains consist in the accentuation on God's utter distinction from the temporarily produced (Juwaynī 21) and the problem of rendering a physical similitude of a human match. Khan attempts to domesticate the text to be acceptable for a certain category of target readers.

<sup>4</sup> A school of thought named after abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī (d. 324). Their main dichotomy from mainstream Muslims lies in their interpretation of God's attributes versus literal interpretation of Ḥanabalīs (Watt, 1986, 1:696).

Khan's choices are more obvious when a prophetic tradition is apt to various juristic interpretations subsequent of semantic ambiguity. In case of opting to foreignization, a translator is presumed to be loyal to the original text. He attempts make his translation as polysemous as the original text. At translator may be held partial to a certain religious group or school of law if he domesticates his translation to a category of readers. For example, the text of the following hadith evoked disagreement among scholars on the legal value of dipping unwashed hands in ablution vessels upon awaking: وَإِذَا اسْتَيْقَظَ أَحَدُكُمْ مِنْ نَوْمِهِ فَلْيَغْسِلْ يَدَيْهِ قَبْلَ أَنْ يُدْخِلَهُمَا فِي الْإِنَاءِ ثَلَاثًا، فَإِنَّ أَحَدَكُمْ لَا (يَدْرِي أَيْنَ بَاتَتْ يَدُهُ). According to Mālik and Shāfi'ī, it is emphatically recommended to wash one's hands before dipping them in an ablution vessel (Ibn Rushd 1, 16). They interpreted the impetrative (فليغسل) as a form of recommendation, though it is of an imperative mode. According to a Shafi'ī or Mālikī translator, the text will be rendered "And whoever wakes up from his sleep should wash his hands three times". Moreover, according to Mālik the ruling is contingent to the case of a person doubting the purity of his hands. Therefore, a Mālikī translator is expected to convey the meaning of doubt in the target text by rendering the phrase (فإن أحدكم لا يدري أين باتت يده) as "for one may not know where his hands were". Dāwūd and Zahirites relied on the explicit meaning of this hadith to confirm that washing hands before immersing them in the ablution bowl is obligatory after having sleep either during day or night (ibid). The text, according to them, should be rendered differently, "And whoever wakes up from his sleep must wash his hands three times before dipping them in the vessel". Aḥmad distinguished between nocturnal sleep and that of the day (ibid). He understood from the words 'ayna bātat (where his hands slept)' the traditional sleep during night. Accordingly the phrase should be translated to mean "where his hands spent the night".

Khan is not consistent in following a certain interpretation though he leans to a definite view and overlooks others. Khan's translation is classified according to various schools of laws as follows:

| Segment   | School of Law                                |
|---|--|
| And whoever wakes up from his <u>sleep</u>                          | Mālik, Shāfi'ī and Zāhirites                 |
| should wash his hands before putting them in the water for ablution | Mālik and Shāfi'ī versus Zāhirites and Aḥmad |
| because nobody knows where his hands were "                         | Shāfi'ī and Aḥmad                            |
| during sleep.   | Mālik, Shāfi'ī and Zāhirites                 |

A proposed translation should be polysomic in the sense it assimilates all possible interpretations of various juristic approaches.

It may be as follows: “And whoever wakes up from his sleep is to wash his hands three times before dipping them in the utensil, because nobody knows where his hands slept”.

For Khan, a translator of a religious text is not only ethically committed to present the foreign faithfully but he is ideologically obliged to endorse his latent beliefs that make him walk on thorns. A translator of a religious text have a duty towards Prophet Muhammad (the author of Hadith), to his readers and to his various cultures whether distinct or shared. By foreignization, a translator prioritize fidelity to the text which is a part of his ethical commitment and ideological beliefs by rendering it free of any leanings.

#### 4. Conclusion

By applying Venuti's (1995) dichotomous strategies of foreignization and domestication to Khan's translation of Bukhārī, I conclude that Khan generally attempts to foreignize his text by accentuating its distinctive syntactic, lexical and cultural features. Khan does not opt for foreignization in all of his choices. Though he shows adherence to Arabic VSO structure, he does not reflect non-regular usage of prepositions and certain Arabic syntactic and stylistic articles such as *taḍmīn*. This is due to a seeming difficulty in rendering them readable to in his English translation.

For his lexical equivalents, Khan prefers foreignization through a dense use of archaic words. However, an extensive exploitation of exotic terms turned some of his texts into mysteries. He opts for orthographic representation of honorific words and phrases, loaded names in addition to proper nouns. His clarifications of those terms do not always result in a fluent and smooth reading of his target language. It includes discursive remarks and explications, which are mostly redundant. He does not show a consistent strategy for rendering toponyms and anthroponyms.

The problem of Khan's translation lies in translating cultural markers. In most cases he disregards euphemism, metonyms and metaphors either by straightly and clearly providing the intended meaning or through the intensive clarifications he provides to reveal mysteries of the elegant Arabic discourse. With regard to ideological and ethical constraints, Khan is not only ethically committed to faithfully present the foreign elements but he is also ideologically obliged to endorse his latent beliefs that make him walk on thorns.

Hadith discourse includes latent cultural, social, ideological and juristic variations which have been subjected to voluminous rubric of

exegeses of creedal, juristic and philological compendiums which resulted in vast arrays of differences among theologians, jurists and philologists. Taking those discrepancies into consideration necessitates that a translator has to show fidelity to the letter of the text. Any alteration or substitution of concepts, lexical items or figures may be supportive of an orientation or an approach. The text has to read as general and polysomic as it first originated. By reference to foreignization and domestication, I opt for foreignization which does not only maintains the foreign elements of the text but maintains its foreign attitudes and orientation to be apt to various interpretations.

## Works Cited

- Abdallah, Manar Abdulhafeedh. *Translating English Euphemisms into Arabic: Challenges and Strategies*. Diss. Sharjah University, 2009.
- Abul-Raof, Hussein. *Arabic Rhetoric, a Pragmatic Analysis*. London and New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Al-Harsi, Abdullah Nasser Khalifah. *Metaphor in (Arabic-into-English) Translation with Specific Reference to Metaphorical Concepts and Expressions in Political Discourse*. Diss. Aston University, 2001.
- Ash-Shirbīnī, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Khaṭīb. *Mughnī al-Muḥtāj li Ma'rifat Alfāz al-Minhāj*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1994.
- Aixelá, J.F. "Culture-specific Items in Translation." In *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Ed. R. Álvarez and M.C. África Vidal. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996. 52–78.
- Assami, Aminah. *Sahih International Quran Translation*. Saudi Arabia: Dar Abdulqasim, 2005.
- Abū Dāwūd, Sulaymān b. al-Ash'ath. *Sunan abi Dāwūd*. Trans. Yasir Qadhi. Riyadh: Darusslam, 2008.
- Berman, Antoine. "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed L. Venuti, New York: Routledge, 1985. 284-298.
- Bukhārī al, abū 'Abdullah Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Mughīrah al-Ju'fī. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Trans. M. Muhsin Khan. Riyadh: Darussalam 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Trans. Aishah Belew. <http://bewley.virtualave.net/>. Web. 25 April 2015.
- Collins, William. *Collins Dictionary*. HarperCollins Publishers, 2006. [www.collinsonlinedictionary.com](http://www.collinsonlinedictionary.com). Web. 14 April 2015.
- Elwell, Walter A., ed. "Entry for 'Apostle'". *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Baker Bytes, 2001.
- Espindola, E. *The Use and Abuse of Subtitling as a Practice of Cultural Representation: Cidade de Deus and Boyz 'N the Hood*. Santa Catarina: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, 2006.
- France, Peter. "Translation Studies and Translation Criticism." In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*. Ed. Peter France. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 3-10.
- Ḥanabkah, 'Abdur-Raḥmān Ḥasan. *Rawā'i' min Aqwāl ar-Rasūl*. Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 1996.
- Hatim, B. and Mason, I. *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- He, Xianbin. "Foreignization/domestication and yihua/guihua: a contrastive study." *Translation Journal* 9(2) 2005. <http://www.bokorlang.com/journal/32foreignization.htm>. Web. 5 May 2015.

- Hermans, Theo. "On Translating Proper Names, with Reference to *De Witte* and *Max Havelaar*." *Modern Dutch Studies*. Ed. Michael Wintle. London: Athlone, 1988. pp. 11-13.
- Ibn abī 'Aṣim. *As-Sunnah*. Ed. M. Nasir ad-Din al-Albani. Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islami, 1400 AH.
- Ibn Ḥajar, Aḥmad b. 'Alī. *Fath al-Bārī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifah, 1379 AH.
- Ibn Jinnī, abū al-Fath 'Uthmān al-Mūṣilī. *Al-Khaṣā'is*. Al-Hay'ah al-'Ammah al-Miṣṣriyyah li al-Kitāb.
- Ibn Rushd, abū al-Walīd Moḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Moḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Rushd. *Bidāyat al-Mujtahid wa Nihāyat al-Muqtaṣid*. Cairo: Dār al-Ḥadīth 2004.
- Lecerle, Jean-Jacques. *The Violence of Language*. London Routledge, 1990.
- Lane, E. W. *Arabic-English Lexicon*. Cambridge: The Islamic Texts Society, 1984.
- Juwaynī, abū al-Ma'ālī 'Abdul-Malik imam al-Ḥaramayn. *Guide to Conclusive Proofs for the Principles of Belief: Al-Irshad*. Trans. Paul E. Walker. Great Books of Islamic Civilization series. Garnet, 2001. المقالة I
- 
- Leech, Geoffrey N. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman, 1983.
- Mālik b. Anas. *Al-Muwatta of Imam Malik Ibn Anas : The First Formulation of Islamic Law*. Trans. Aisha Abdurrahman Bewley, Scotland: Madinah Press Inverness, 2015.
- Mansour, Mariam H. "Domestication and Foreignization in Translating Culture-Specific References of an English Text into Arabic. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 2(2), 23-36. <http://eltsjournal.org>. Web. 10 April 2015.
- Merriam-Webster.com*. Merriam-Webster, 2011. Web 8 April 2015.
- Munday, J. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. New York Routledge, 2001.
- Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj an-Naysābūrī. *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Trans. Abdul Hamid Siddiqui. Kitab Bhavan 2000. <https://www.shareislam.com/order/books/SahihMuslim.pdf>. Web 6 May 2015.
- Myskja, Kjetil. "Foreignisation and resistance: Lawrence Venuti and his critics." *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 12(2). 1-23.
- Nasā'ī al, Aḥmad b. Shu'ayb b. 'Ali b. Sinān b. Baḥr. *Sunan an-Nasā'ī*. Tran. Aḥmad Khattāb. Riyadh: Darussalam, 2007.
- New International Version*. [Colorado Springs]: Biblica, 2011. BibleGateway.com. Web. 6 April. 2015.
- Poucke, Piet Van. "Domestication and foreignization in translation studies." *TransUD-Arbeiten zur Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens*, 2012 . 139-157.

- Pound, Ezra. *Literary Essays*, New York: New Directions and London: Faber and Faber, 1954.
- Sidighi, A. "Translating Persian Metaphors into English." *Metaphor and Imagery in Persian Poetry*. Ed. Ali Asghar Seyed-Gohrab. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Soskice, Janet M.. *Metaphor and religious language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Tymoczko M. "The Metonymics of Translating Marginalized Texts". *Comparative Literature* 47 no.1, 1995. 11-24.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Translation in a Postcolonial Context*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1999.
- Venuti, L. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Differences*, London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Watt, W. Montgomery. "Ash'ariyya." *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. Brill 1986.
- Yang, Wenfen. "Brief Study of Domestication and Foreignization in Translation." *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2010. 77-80.
- Yāsīn abū al-Hayjā'. *Mazāhir at-Tajdīd an-Naḥwī lada Majma' al-Lughah al-'Arabiyyah fi al-Qāhirah*. 'Alām al-Kutub al-Ḥadīth, 2008.